



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/333,894	06/14/1999	ARSHISH Cyrus KAPADIA	0544MH-3426	4656

7590

11/14/2002

ATTN: CHRISTOPHER W. KENNERLY, ESQ.
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

KERR, DEBRA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/333,894

Applicant(s)

KAPADIA ET AL.

Examiner

Debra E Kerr

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Examiner rejected claims 1-27 in a First Office Action of January 30th, 2002. In an amendment filed on March 20th, 2002, applicants amended claims 1-4 and 6-24, cancelled claim 5, and added claims 28-43.

Claims 1-4 and 6-43 are pending; they will be considered for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-3, 6-24, 27-39, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henson (US 6,167,383).

Henson describes an online product configurator which is customizable for each customer. The system generates a series of selection options for a custom configured computer system and customer set such as individual, small business or federal government and dynamically supplies configuration, merchandising and payment options according to which customer set a user is identified as belonging to. A compatibility check ensures that each option selected will work with all previous selections so that the user does not configure a system with incompatible components which cannot physically be built. Any option or combination of options that will delay delivery of the system is flagged as such with a dynamically generated long lead time indicator next to the option. The system also cross-checks all options at selection time and on detection of a problematic combination of options, the user is warned that the specific options will not work together. Selections are presented to the user based on whether the user is building a system for home or business use, and options such as leasing are dynamically presented to the user based on whether the system is for home or business use. The system also provides premier pages with private, password protected options such as discount pricing for selected preferred customers (see at least Figures 3-8, col. 2, line 61 – col. 3 line 54, col. 6 line 31 – col. 7 line 21, col. 7 line 57 – col. 8 line 6, col. 8 lines 34-44, col. 8 line 56 – col. col. 9 line 7, col. 14 lines 35-61, and col. 15 lines 31-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 25, 26, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson in view of Kennedy (US 6,188,989).

Henson substantially discloses the claimed invention, including a database for determining long lead times and warning users that a selected configuration is not available or will be delivered much later than another configuration. Henson is silent regarding an optimization function that minimizes price or maximizes profits. Kennedy teaches an available to promise engine that allows a customer to pay extra for speedy production of an item that would normally require a much longer production time (see at least col. 3 line 53 – col. 4 line 4, and col. 7 line 55 – col. 8 line 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Henson's online configuration engine with the teaching of Kennedy regarding an available-to-promise engine that minimizes price or maximizes profits, in order to increase sales by providing flexibility to customers based on the customers' priorities and preferences.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra E Kerr whose telephone number is (703) 305-3184. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., first Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on (703) 308-1344. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

Debra E. Kerr

DEK

November 5, 2002

Jeffrey A. Smith
JEFFREY A. SMITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER